

UTAH AIR QUALITY BOARD MEETING
July 7, 2004
MINUTES

I. Call to Order

The Board Chair, John Veranth, called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

Board members present:

John Veranth	Jim Horrocks	Joann Seghini
Jonathan Cherry	Dianne Nielson	Jeff Utley
Jerry Grover	Richard Olson	Ernest Wessman
Scott Hirschi		

Executive Secretary: Richard W. Sprott

II. Dates of upcoming Air Quality Board Meetings:

August 4, 2004 and September 1, 2004.

III. Approval of the Minutes of June 2, 2004 Board Meeting.

Correction on page 5 line 2, interruptive should be interpretive. Jerry Grover moved to approve the minutes, a second by Richard Olsen. Motion passed.

IV. Propose for Public Comment: Amend R307-202, areas outside Davis, Salt Lake, Utah and Weber Counties; Open Burning; and add new rule R307-303, Davis, Salt Lake, Utah and Weber Counties; Open Burning. Presented by: Jan Miller

The open burning rule that Utah has had for many years includes the oldest air quality provisions in state rules, some older than the Clean Air Act itself. Over the years bits and pieces have been added. This year staff is reviewing the entire rule. Some of the provisions in the rule are now covered by other rules, both state and federal, and some activities are not covered at all. Also, the language needed to be rewritten to make it clearer. Staff had sent out drafts to the local health departments, state and county fire officials and the state forester. On the whole they have been supportive.

Rusty Lundberg, from Solid and Hazardous Waste was introduced and would be able to answer any questions about the solid wasteland fill under the DEQ revisions.

Staff recommends that the Board propose of these rules for public comment.

In answer to Mr. Grover's question of who is considered authorized to approve burning, Ms. Miller replied that for the purposes of this rule, the definition of local government means any authorized city and county fire protection agency that the government puts in charge. There was no common terminology.

In the new rule under the PM10 SIP, there is no burning in landfills along the Wasatch Front. In the rural areas it could be permitted, if the Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste permits,

and the public gets a variance from the Air Quality Board. Local county governments, if they choose, can pick a 30-day window, with weather permitting, that home owners are allowed to burn for yard clean up. Utah and Weber County do allow burning in some places and under certain conditions. Salt Lake and Davis Counties do not allow burns.

Mr. Grover asked if staff was interpreting that the county had the authority to issue the burn permit or did it have to be the municipality? Ms. Miller replied that it was whatever local government was in charge. The local official needs to know what is going on in case a fire gets out of hand and the local fire department can then respond.

Scott Hirschi moved to approve with Ernie Wessman seconding. Motion passed.

V. Propose for Public Comment: Amendments to R307-214-2, Incorporation by Reference, Various Subparts of 40 CFR Part 63, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS), MACT standards. Presented by: Eileen Brennan.

In the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, the EPA was tasked with preparing new technology-based rules to regulate Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) emissions. The Act originally included 189 HAPs to be regulated, currently there are 188 listed HAPs.

The EPA was tasked to look at these HAP emissions from very specific source categories, or industry types. These included industries where each individual facility location had the potential to emit large quantities of HAPs (like refineries or chemical manufacturers), as well as industries where individual facilities were small emitters of HAPs, but had hundreds of locations (like drycleaners).

These new federal technology-based regulations for specific source categories were called MACTs or Maximum Achievable Control Technology rules.

States could let the EPA be the enforcing agency within their state, or each state had the option to secure delegation of these MACTs from the EPA in order to enforce the MACTs within their own boundaries.

In 1994, the Utah Division of Air Quality committed to providing the resources necessary to implement and enforce the MACT program within Utah. By DAQ maintaining primacy in the implementation and enforcement of these regulations, this ensured Utah stakeholders' interests would be protected and the permitting process for all Utah sources would be streamlined.

As needed over the following years, DAQ adopted-by-reference new federal MACTs into the Utah Air Rules to ensure primacy in the administration of the MACT program within the state.

This latest action by DAQ to adopt recently finalized MACT standards allows the Utah MACT program to remain current in the administration of the rules affecting Utah sources.

At least 10 of the 15 rules included in this action are expected to affect sources in Utah.

Therefore, staff recommends these 15 new MACT standards be proposed for adoption-by reference into the Utah Air Rules.

Jerry Grover noted that the formatting looked like staff had added then struck out the published date in the Federal Register. Ms. Brennen explained that the federal government prints the CFR once a year on July 1. The MACT was adopted and finalized after the publishing date of July 1. Staff felt it prudent to put in the citation for where it could be found on-line.

Ernie Wessman proposed a motion to approve for public comment to adopt the 15 additional MACT standards that are proposed for incorporation for reference in Utah rules with Scott Hirschi seconding. The motion passed.

V. Propose for Public Comment: Amend R307-110-12 and State Implementation Plan Section IX.C.7, the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Salt Lake City; and amend R307-110-33 and State Implementation Plan Section X.C, the Vehicle Emissions Inspection and Maintenance Plan for Salt Lake County. Presented by Jan Miller.

For an FYI, Jan Miller mentioned that the EPA had approved the emissions budget in the Provo City Maintenance plan that the Board had adopted several months ago. The new motor vehicle budgets are now in place for conformity in Utah County. The oxyfuel is at EPA for approval for final signature.

The Carbon Monoxide plan is an update of the maintenance plan that was adopted in 1996. It uses the inventory method to demonstrate continue maintenance; that is, by showing that the inventory of carbon monoxide emissions continues to decline from the amount of emissions in the attainment year of 1993. It is expected that no violations of the standard will occur in the future. As you know, the carbon monoxide emissions come primarily from vehicles, and as cleaner vehicles replace the older ones, carbon monoxide emissions are dropping fairly rapidly and that is nationwide as well.

Rather than going in and amending the 1996 text, EPA Region VIII advised us to use as a basis the Colorado Springs plan as the basic text because it was very simple. EPA approved the original maintenance plan in 1999. The way the maintenance demonstration works is that after EPA has approved the maintenance plan, DAQ has to demonstrate maintenance for 10 years. Twenty years is the time line for conformity numbers, also; once the 20 years have passed, we no longer have to go on demonstrating maintenance. Instead of just doing the maintenance plan for 10 years out, we have done the maintenance plan out until 2019. That is 20 years after EPA approved the first one.

This plan also sets motor vehicle emission budgets, for purposes of conformity, for the years 2005 and 2019. Those are the years that staff are required to show. There is a substantial safety margin in both of those years because the CO emissions are dropping. Staff suggested that the Board allocate most of it to the mobile source sector. There is a new MOBILE model and this needs to be done now. By giving the safety margin to the mobile source sector, the new model may not have to be run again or revised a later model adjusts upward the amount of carbon monoxide emissions from the vehicles. Staff proposes that the Board

allocate 108.39 tons per day to the mobile source sector in 2005, in addition to the amount requested by Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), and 158.73 tons per day in addition to WFRC request for 2019. In both years staff has asked that 20 tons of that safety margin, which is about 5% of the total emissions, be left unallocated in order to cover any unanticipated growth in the area and non-road mobile emissions. With this allocation, staff would not have to redo this plan again. The monitor values of CO are now running about half the standard. The prediction is that carbon monoxide is going to continue to drop; and efforts should be focused on matters that can make a difference in the environmental and public health.

Mr. Grover commented that it was a good thing and will this apply to other maintenance plans? It seems that it is not requiring pre-selected contingency measures. This plan has a list of items to look at and yet leaves it open-ended. Ms. Miller replied that this was done in Provo and Ogden. Items were listed to look at and a timetable was created. Region VIII has approved the Colorado Springs plan, so there seems to be an advantage in using the same thing.

Scott Hirschi asked if staff had actually planned to apply the 20-ton (5%) contingency if needed. Ms. Miller said that it was expected in 2019 that there would be a 175 tons total emissions and what WFRC has asked for in Table 3 page 5 in 2019 is 104.8. Staff is proposing that they end up with 262.81 and that is 150 tons more than what is being asked for, with another 20 tons being held on to. There is no-emissions growth through 2019 and that is a long time to project. So the 20 tons is held in reserve in case it is needed.

Mr. Hirschi asked if the total of 175 tons in 2019 include a buffer? Ms. Miller replied that is a projection of what the emissions are expected to be. The buffer is the difference between that and the emissions in 1993 of the attainment year. There is a big safety margin there. Bill Colbert said that back in 1993, staff showed attainment with quite a bit of margin. The monitors were nowhere near exceeding the standard. Mr. Sprott showed that the budget for 2019 is 262.81 (page 7, line 31) and what the mobile source people think they need is 104.08 (Table 3 page 5).

Mr. Wessman pointed out that on page 5, line 13, it states: "As the projections demonstrate, this change in the I/M program does *endanger* attainment of the standard. Ms. Miller thanked him and said it should say, "It does not endanger."

Mr. Utley asked what is included in the projects for non-road and does miscellaneous non-road equipment mean construction and ATV vehicles? Ms Miller indicated tables 1 and 2 on pages 3 and 4 at the bottom that it included aircraft, railroad and miscellaneous, non-road equipment. Carol Nielsen, Inventory Coordinator, also explained that what miscellaneous non-road includes is lawn mowers, snowmobiles, ATV's, trucks at Kennecott, mining quarries, and miscellaneous engines that run throughout the county.

Mr. Grover asked if there were any anticipated emission controls for carbon monoxide in the future for any of these non road vehicles and what was used for the basis for the projection. Ms. Nielsen replied that the projections are made from EPA software called 'Non Road' and that new diesel factors were not put into those projections. There is a new one coming out. Non-road diesel rules are not included in these factors.

Bill Colbert stated that since most Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions are produced by vehicles, staff is also proposing to revise the Salt Lake County I/M SIP to reflect program changes over the past few years. The first change is the biennial component for vehicles 6 years or newer. Also, Salt Lake County has fully implemented its On-board Diagnostics (OBD) program to reflect new technology built into 1996 and newer model vehicles. The Salt Lake Council has also removed the ceiling for I/M fees charged to consumers within the county, so inspection fees are now free market-based. Thus far, competition has kept the fees in line, with no significant fee increases. Representative Wayne Harper tried to restore the fee ceiling to \$25 for I/M testing through legislation, but the bill didn't get through the committee. There is also a \$3 air pollution control (APC) fee that the county charges with registration that is separate from the emission and inspection fee.

Mr. Grover asked if this is an appendix, does Utah County administer the program? If Utah County changes something in their program, does it require a whole SIP and does it require the Board to review it all? In response, Mr. Colbert said that the county had made minor changes to the program and it does not have to be followed with a SIP. If they change the air pollution control (APC) fee, it won't affect whether it is a viable program.

Mr. Hirsch asked if it would prevent any problems by setting a fee of not less than \$3 per vehicle to give the county flexibility without amending the SIP? Mr. Colbert responded that staff could check with the county to concur with that, but that would give the county flexibility if they wanted to drop the fee. Ms. Miller noted that if it was a specific requirement in the SIP to have a minimum of \$3.00, and if there were any other significant changes that would affect the fee, then the Board would have to revise the whole thing.

Jim Brand, Director of Air Pollution Control from Salt Lake County Health Department, was introduced. Salt Lake County does not anticipate a change in the fee. The fee provides funding and currently the county has sufficient funds to run the program. There has not been a problem with that in the past provided there are not any other changes. It would be sufficient if it remains as it is. Mr. Brand thanked the Board for the consideration.

Mr. Colbert explained that if the legislature was to exempt vehicles 25 years or older, like some states have, staff would have to remodel the program and make sure it still met the requirements; and then revise the SIP accordingly because that would make a significant program change. The legislature felt that vehicles 6 years or newer were less likely to malfunction since they are more reliable and durable. With bi-annual inspections it ensured that vehicles were running ok with less emission failure. If you went past 6 years, there was some concern that vehicles may go out of their EPA emissions warranty for the critical components. It had consumer implications. It is 80,000 miles for the critical components but a lot of people put on 80,000 miles in 6 years.

Mr. Grover moved that agenda item V. be proposed for public comment. Richard Olson seconded it and the Board approved.

Mr. Hirschi asked what was the purpose and was it a necessary step for these rules to come before the Board before public comment? Ms. Miller explained that the statute says the board

makes rules and staff cannot propose a rule for public comment. If the Board does not like an action, the Board can send it back, refuse to deal with it, or amend it

VI. Withdrawal of Utah's Submittal to EPA to R307-343, Davis and Salt Lake Counties and Ozone Nonattainment areas: Emission Standards for Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations. Presented by Dave McNeill.

In 1999, the Board adopted R307-343, which implemented the wood furniture volatile organic compounds Control Technique Guideline (CTG's) in the Salt Lake and Davis Counties. In late 1999, DAQ submitted this rule to EPA for approval as part of Utah's Ozone Maintenance Plan, in which Utah had committed to review CTGs as they were developed and implement them in Utah. EPA has never acted on the 1999 submittal. The packet had included a memo from Colleen Delaney in which she explained why we should withdraw this particular rule from EPA's inclusion in the federally approved SIP, but maintain it as a state-enforceable rule.

John Veranth asked what the process was to withdraw a rule from EPA. Mr. McNeill explained that rules were routinely withdrawn from EPA. For example, he cited the Provo CO SIP that had been submitted to EPA in the early 1990s, but which EPA had never approved. Earlier this year, when Utah submitted a new SIP to EPA, they asked that we formally withdraw the earlier submittal as part of the approval process, which we did. EPA has also returned rules that EPA could not act on and asked staff to withdraw it, such as the contingency measures for PM10. Since staff originally submitted R307-343 to EPA, the implementation policy for the new 8-hour ozone standard has been proposed. Staff feels that it might be advantageous to Utah to retain this rule as a state-only pre-implementation strategy. Implementation of the MACT that was promulgated simultaneously with the CTG has resulted in a significant reduction of VOC emissions from all of the large sources in this category. DAQ did not take any credit in the current SIP for the MACT or the CTG.

The implementation policy for the 8-hour ozone standard requires staff to write a new ozone maintenance plan before 2007. Utah will be able to take credit for any of these pre-implemented strategies in that 2007 Maintenance Plan.

Mr. Grover stated that his understanding of what the Board does and what the statute requires is that the Board follow the federal rules, unless something else is specified in the SIP, or is indicated in a health study. If what staff is proposing is part of a SIP and you are getting outside what the federal requirements, then certain criteria have to be met. If it is withdrawn from the SIP, there should be no problem unless it becomes a free-standing rule. Mr. McNeill explained that this rule is already free standing because EPA has never approved it. The rules that the Board adopts are enforceable by the DAQ. They are rules in the state of Utah. The SIP says that the Board will adopt the CTG as EPA issues them. So the Board and DAQ are following the letter of the law (SIP) and meeting the requirement to adopt the CTG, but are not submitting it to EPA to become federally enforceable. The Board adopted the rules that implemented the CTG and they are enforceable in the state of Utah. Mr. McNeill stated that Fred Nelson from the Attorney General's office recommended that staff ask the Board to direct them (staff) to request that EPA send back the submittal, unless the members of the Board want this to be federally enforceable. Otherwise, this will be brought into the new ozone plan if it is appropriate.

Dianne Nielson asked that since it may be in the new ozone plan, why wouldn't staff leave it in place until the new ozone plan was prepared and then make that determination. Otherwise you create a gap in terms of Federal enforcement. Mr. McNeill explained that the reason that staff was not looking at including it in the current plan is because it will become a de facto requirement in the new plan. Staff would not be able to see if it was appropriate until the new plan was looked at. Ms. Nielson asked why does it become a de facto requirement? Mr. McNeill explained that there was a backsliding provision in the Clean Air Act because when you go from one standard to a next standard you cannot get rid of any federally enforceable rule unless you can prove it had absolutely no effect on the new standard.

Mr. Horrocks asked if staff thought that the EPA would adopt this prior to submitting it to the new ozone plan? Mr. McNeill replied that they do. The EPA is in the process of reviewing the rule for their final approval, and they had some questions about it. When staff looked into answering those questions, several other questions arose about how this rule will fit into the implementation of the new ozone standard. He said that the State needs to think about this before we put it in the 2007 maintenance plan. The other issues are that we claimed no credit in the old plan and we may need or want to claim credit for these strategies in the new plan. After discussing this with Mr. Nelson, it became obvious that this is the way to go with this.

Mr. Wessman said that since the new ozone plan is under development and this could complicate the development of this plan, he moved that the Board approve the staff recommendation that the Board withdraw the submittal of R307-343 to EPA, keeping the rule effective at the state level until the ozone plan could be worked up.

Seconded by Scott Hirschi. The Board approved.

VIII. Response to June 2 Air Quality Board Motion for Clarifications to the Operating Permits compliance Certification Requirements. Presented by Tim Andrus

On June 2, staff was directed by the Board to return today to propose a rule change or addition to the Operating Permits Compliance Certification rule clarifying the impact of a deviation on a certification of compliance. [Over the past month, staff has reviewed available information on continuous compliance, primarily preambles to EPA rulemakings and relevant rule context.](#) In addition, EPA Region VIII was also contacted with specific questions on the topic (compiled version attached). [An addition to the rule specifying that "the status of a permit term or condition may be certified as continuous compliance only if no deviation occurred for that permit term or condition during the specified reporting period" could be proposed. However, EPA would likely require additional restrictions such as "provided all required monitoring and record keeping are performed." It is our understanding that more specific language would not be welcome to our regulated sources.](#) Conversely, an alternative rule change, saying something like "a deviation that does not result in a violation does not prohibit certification of continuous compliance" for one example, would not be accepted by EPA and would likely endanger the delegation of our title V program or specific Title V permits. [Staff is concerned about proceeding with any change to this rule at this time.](#) Because any language change would result in a departure from the federally approved language provided in Part 70, upon which our program is based, [any](#)

change may become problematic in the future as a new excess emissions rule is developed or if EPA changes its position. Finally, given the short time allowed for this action, normal stakeholder interaction and review has not fully occurred.

Staff recommends that a rule change not be proposed at this time but that staff be allowed to continue to work with stakeholders with a goal of reaching consensus on how this rule will be implemented.

Last time the Board approved the language that was proposed by EPA, re-incorporating that sources had certified that their compliance status was continuous or intermittent, and removing the statement whether or not the method for determining the status was continuous or intermittent.

Mike Tomko, from Parsons, Behle and Latimer was introduced. He represents Utah Industrial Environmental Coalition (UIENC.)

UIENC agrees with the recommendations of the staff. After discussions with Mr. Sprott, Mr. Bird and Mr. Olsen, this is a reasonable way to proceed, although there is some uncertainty. The staff has agreed that it is appropriate to have discussions and workshops with the regulated community and public so everyone is on the same page in terms of what compliance certification requires. UINEC does not have any objections to the language and regulation itself if it is just an interruptive issue and how to interpret certain circumstances that could be clarified with workshops.

Mr. Veranth stated that if the regulated community is clearly informed that this is how it is interpreted, it should clarify all the “for instances.” Mr. Utley asked who was going to organize the workshops to help the regulated community? Tim Andrus replied that the Division would organize the workshops. One of the more difficult aspects is the term of the unavoidable breakdown rule and it appears to be on track that the rule will be amended in a way that EPA will be satisfied with, and that it will remove some of the issues that staff has had. When the unavoidable breakdown rule is finalized or revised, it will resolve things.

Cheryl Heying explained that the staff had sent a draft of the excess emission rule to a group of stakeholders. There had been several discussions and it had been sent out again with comments to be back by July 19. Staff expects this rule to be before the Board for the September meeting. Mr. Sprott interjected that staff had begun a series of meetings in parallel with those final steps.

Mr. Wessman suggested that the Board accept staff recommendation to not make a rule change at this time. Seconded by Mr. Hirschi and the motion passed.

IX. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. 2004 Choose Clean Air Campaign. Presented by Reanette Anderson and Summer Clarke, from the office of Planning and Public Affairs (PPA).

DEQ has received a grant from EPA to do a campaign that links the health benefits of getting out of your car and walking instead of driving. This campaign has been going on for several

months. The PPA had a University of Utah class do a survey to find out what people believe about air quality. The good news is 76% respondents recognized that automobiles did contribute to the air pollution. Over 50% people felt that the air needed to be cleaned up and they also recognized that walking was a good alternative to driving and they should walk more to get fit. PPA would like to combine with the cardiovascular campaign in the Department of Health (DOH) walking campaign. The bad news is that people know they should walk more instead of driving, but nobody is doing it. PPA is in the process of working with a group of people to create an outreach campaign to develop stakeholders group.

Summer Clark has been going to marathons to distribute the flyers "Park It Walk It." The Utah Lung Association, Utah Medical Association, Utah Department of Health, UTA and McDonalds are being organized for long term planning. KSL Radio 1160, Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune and the Provo Daily Herald will be running the promotional campaign ads "Park It Walk It" through the end of August.

Ms. Anderson explained that for long-term planning, a model community is being sought where various civic groups could be organized to figure out how a walking campaign could be implemented to educate people in walking short trips. If this works, then it would be implemented statewide.

B. Public Hearings. Presented by Rick Sprott/Cheryl Heying

Upcoming public hearing information will be presented at the August Board meeting.

C. SIPs Update. Presented by Bill Reiss

Mr. Reiss presented the handout and explained pending SIP items and rule making actions that were coming up in the next year. The items were broken down into horizons of 3 months, 3-9 months and after 9 months segments. Items for 3 months included, CO maintenance plans for Salt Lake and Ogden; IM SIP for Salt Lake, Weber and Davis counties; SO₂ maintenance plan for Salt Lake County; and propose the excess emissions rule for public comment. On the 3-9 month agenda is the PM10 maintenance plan for the Wasatch Front and various rule revisions for public comment to be presented to the November Board. After 9 months is the transportation conformity SIP, NSR reform rule revisions and the 8-hour Ozone Maintenance plan that is due December 31, 2005. With the phase out of the 1-hour ozone standard to be replaced with the 8-hour standard, staff will propose a new ozone maintenance plan, which is required in 2007.

Mr. Wessman asked if the courts have stayed the NSR reform rule revisions and does this affect the target date? Mr. Reiss responded that the target date had been dictated by that rule and may be part of what is being contested in the courts. Mr. Sprott explained that there were 2 sets of NSR rules and this date applies to the first set. The first rule had not been stayed, so it was still officially a rule and the staff is actively pursuing towards the 2006 date. The other rule has been stayed, and staff has not been pursuing it at this point in time.

Mr. Horrocks asked if there was a specific due date on the transportation conformity SIP since the Board will have only 12 months to respond by the deadline of June 2005. Mr. Reiss

responded that it had been approved but the actual date had not been set and it had not yet been published in the Federal Register. Mr. Horrocks then asked if this would be a routine fix or a major change? The staff was requested to provide a time line of the various steps as to when it would come before the Board. Mr. Colbert said that after the final EPA approval, the Board would have 12 months to respond.

Susan Hardy, Mountainland Association of Governments, stated that the conformity SIP is a mode of operation between interagencies. It involves the MPO's, UDOT and DAQ, the 3 agencies that will operate with each other. They decide how, in what time lines, who approves what and who prepares what information in the transportation conformity process. They will deal with the mode of operation and come up with a conformity requirement of what every area needs to do. They will come up with a document that delineates who has responsibility, how and when they will put it together.

D. Monitoring for June. Presented by Bob Dalley

Mr. Dalley presented and discussed handouts for PM10 for May and June filters. There were high spikes due to the high winds in May and June. The PM2.5 was also high during the high winds. Because there was an exceedence of the standard in Ogden during the July 4 fireworks in 2003, camera monitors were set up this year at the community center. There were a lot of fireworks in front of individual residences and for a short period of time there was a lot of smoke. The handout graph shows the effect of fireworks measured in Ogden for 2004. Mr. Sprott commented that this situation had been brought to the EPA's attention regionally and nationally and asked for their assistance on how to deal with this because fireworks cannot be regulated. The filters were analyzed to confirm that they were fireworks. Filter data from Hawaii and San Francisco have shown that firework pollution in Salt Lake could be less. DAQ's monitor is capturing real data. There needs to be more education towards health hazards from the smoke.

Ms. Nielson asked what the impact was due to the drying out of the lakebeds of the Great Salt Lake in terms of high wind events and the monitors.

According to Mr. Dalley, nothing was showing at the monitors. Kennecott calls in before every wind event reporting the conditions of the tailings pond and how wet they are. They also let DAQ know about the blowing dust from the lakeshores. Ms. Nielson said there were significant clouds coming off the north end of the lakebeds on July 3. She also asked if the monitors were picking up PM10 or were the particles coarser than that? Mr. Sprott replied that staff would look at the North Salt Lake monitor. Also, about that same time there were rainsqualls that came into the Bountiful area.

In conclusion Mr. Dalley reported that there had been no "Choose Clean Air Days" called so far for the summer.

E. HAPS Compliance. Presented by Bryce Bird.

There were no questions. Mr. Bird introduced Bob Ford as the new manager of the HAPS section.

F. Compliance. Presented by Jeff Dean.

No questions.

X. Miscellaneous

Mr. Veranth reported that Board member Jon Cherry had submitted his resignation. His new job would take him to the Midwest. The Mining Association would be looking for a new replacement.

Meeting adjourned at 3 pm.